

(2.)

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
ANSWER
TO THE
CONSIDERATIONS
That Obliged
PETER MANBY, &c.
TO
Embrace, as he pretended, what he calls
THE
CATHOLICK RELIGION.
BEING

An *ANSWER* to the First DIALOGUE,
already printed, of his *Reformed Catechism*.

By *William King* M. A. and Chancellor of *St. Patricks, Dublin*.

Dublin, Printed by *Joseph Ray*, and are to be sold by *William Norman*, Bookseller in *Dames-street*, and at the Printing-house on *Colledge-green*. 1688.

INDICATED

OF THE

2 1911

1911

1911

THE

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

The PREFACE.

I Designed not to trouble the Reader with any Preface; but finding by the Printer that there would be two pages void, I thought it not amiss to observe, that it might reasonably be expected, that Mr. M. who is so forward to accuse others, should have taken more pains to vindicate himself and his Reasons in the following particulars: which having not done, some will be apt to assign a reason for his silence.

The particulars are, 1. Why he chose this time to declare himself a Roman Catholick? and whether he never read the Mass, or found himself deceived by false Reports before?

2. Why he began his Pamphlet with an Equivocal Dedication? Of the like Blunder he is Guilty in his last Title page in contracting Master before William, which the Scots language allows before John and James, &c. but never before William, which spoils his beloved Jest.

3. How he, who accuses other Men of Sacrilege, can acquit himself, while he keeps the profits of his Deanery? And whether it may not be suspected, that he would have kept his Orders and Religion, as well as his Deanery, if they had yielded him as much per Annum?

4. Why he was so very earnest for a Protestant Bishoprick, and so discontented that he could not compass it?

5. How he could appeal in his Letter to all that have known him, to witness that no Temporal Interest inclined him to be reconciled; when so many of those that knew him believe and vouch the contrary?

6. How he acquits himself from falsifying Heylin; with which I tax him, p. 10. from falsifying the Communion-Service, tax p. 42 and 43. the Scripture, p. 60. and Calvin, p. 82?

7. How he acquits himself from these plain mistakes in matter of Fact? with which I charged him. 1. In asserting that Doctor Burnet doth not produce one instance of any moment, wherein he dares say Heylin is false: the contrary to which is shewn, p. 11. p. 38.

2. In asserting that he found no Harmony in the Opinion of Protestant Bishops about Confession: which is shewn to be false, p. 41. 3. In affirming, that Confession is approved and frequented by all the Christian World, except the People of our Islands, &c. and that our Church wants Confession; shewn to be false, p. 47. 4. In vouching that it was never heard in the Catholick Church till Henry the Eighth, that any was admitted to Communion without Auricular Confession; p. 48.

5. In magnifying the Prayers in the Mass as elevated and judicious: proved false, p. 63. 6. That Protestants object nothing against Confessing and Praying to Saints and Angels; but what Presbyterians do against the Canticle Benedicite: proved false p. 64. 7. That unlearned Catholicks understand as much or more of the Mass than illiterate Protestants do of the Common-Prayer: proved false, p. 67. 8. That there are a great many expositions of the Mass extant in print by Commandment of the Church: proved false, p. 68.

9. That the Jewish Church had almost all her Scriptures and publick Service for 14 Generations in a language not then understood by the common people: proved false, p. 68. 10. That the Latine is more vulgar than

than the English: *ibid.* 11. That if Churches had their Service each in their own Language, it would destroy all Community of Sacraments and Liturgy between the Members of the Catholick Church: *proved false*, p. 70. 12. That Roman Catholicks pay no more respect to Images, than Protestants do to the Elements of Bread and Wine; and that we say, these are but a Figure or Image of Christ's Body and Blood: *proved false*, p. 71, 72. 13. That a man shall find no Schism or Discord about Sacraments or Liturgy, no Rents, nor Disobedience to Superiours in the Church of Rome: *proved manifestly false*, p. 75, &c. Till Mr. M. has cleared himself from these mistakes in plain matter of Fact, he must not expect any body that values truth will mind what he says.

8. How will he clear himself from abusing Scripture in impertinently quoting it; with which he stands charged, p. 7. and 8. p. 44. p. 60. p. 71.

9. How he can pretend to have answered me; when he has left the Arguments he produced on the several heads to shift for themselves, without almost so much as an attempt to vindicate them. Thus he deals with most of those about Mission: all that concern Confession: All those by which he designed to prove, that if the Roman Church were not the Catholick Church, there could be none; for this reason only; that all Idolatry is inconsistent with the being of a true Church. Thus he deals with all those he produced in favour of the Mass: of the Devotions and Practices of their Church, in praying to Saints and Angels, Worshipping Images, and Prayer in an unknown Tongue. And lastly, with all he said, to shew that the Dissenters had as much reason to separate from us as we had to Reform. Which was indeed the only Material thing in his Considerations; till he vindicate his Arguments on these Heads, the World will take it for granted he is satisfied with the Answers, though he think it not convenient to own it.

10. With what Conscience can he produce any faults of the Reformers to invalidate their Mission, or blemish their Doctrine, who puts off all the ill Practices and Opinions of some Roman Catholicks objected by us (that is of some Popes, Cardinals, Councils, and whole Orders of Men amongst them) as no Argument at all?

11. How he can accuse the Protestant Church, as having no other Foundation than every Man's Reason; and yet not be pleased to tell us by what Faculties, besides his Sences and Reason, he came to choose his Religion; or to know that the Roman is the Catholick Church? or whether he has any other ground to believe these, besides what is founded on the truth of those Faculties? and whether they do not as unquestionably tell him that there is Bread in the Sacrament, as that there is a Roman Church? and why he believes them not as well in the one case as the other.

12. Whether his Questions about the one Catholick Church do not suppose that wherever there is a breach of Communion between particular Churches (suppose between the Eastern and Western, the Greek and Latins, the Roman, African, French or English Churches) there one party must cease to be a Member of the Catholick Church? and how he proves this Supposition, or Answers my Arguments against it, p. 4?

Lastly, How he can refuse the Communion of our Church; when he cannot bring any reasonable exception against one Article in our Faith, or Petition in our Liturgy; or how our Governours unlawful, or Faith deficient?

A Vindication of the Answer to the Considerations that obliged Peter Manby, &c. to embrace, as he pretends, what he calls the Catholick Religion; being an Answer to the first Dialogue of his late Reformed Catechism.

C H A P. I.

§ 1. **I** Lately published an Answer to Mr. *Manby's* Considerations, in which I gave them, for my own sake, and the Readers, all the Force I could; and presented them, as several have told me, with better advantages than as they lay in his immethodical Paper. I knew very well that his Faculty did not lie in close Reasoning: and though of most men he seems to have the greatest Itch to be in Print: yet I did not expect that he would either undertake a regular Confirmation of his own Considerations, or answer my Reasons against them. The event shews that I was not mistaken in my conjecture, he has at last brought forth a Catechism, which he says in the Title is *in Reply to Mas William Kings Answer to Dean Manby's Considerations*. It is well he told us at the entrance for what he intended it: for I am of opinion, no body, who reads it, would have found that to be its design: or how it could have deserved that Title. But Mr. *M.* has this comfort, that the Title, though it have no affinity to the Book, is yet generally judged to be very suitable to it. And he may rest satisfied, as I believe he must be by this time; that he has exposed himself, not me, by it. He and I are sufficiently known: and no body thinks it strange, that he should mistake my Title, when he mistakes his own. I am as much *Mas William King*, as he is Dean of *Londonderry*: this is a Deanery of his own coining: I can find none such in *Ireland*. He mistakes the meer Lay-Sequestrator (if we believe himself) of

the Deanry of Derry for the Dean of *Londonderry*. He tells me, *pag. 91.* that the *Church of Scotland* is my *natural Mother*, which is false: for I never was in *Scotland* in my life. And for my Education, it was in the Religion I profess; first at a conformable School, and then at the University of *Dublin*; where I took as many Degrees, and spent as long Time, and in better days, than Mr. M. But suppose I had been born and educated in *Scotland*, as well as I am descended from thence, this had been nothing to the purpose, nor had mine Answer been ever the less reasonable, or I the worse Man; sure it is better to be *dutiful to a Foster-Mother*, with which he taxes me, *p. 91.* than to rebel against a *natural one*, and call her a Harlot. He blames me for *Scurrility and uncleanness of Language*, and that I write not like a *Gentleman or well-bred Scholar*: I must refer it to the Reader, who is most guilty of that fault. There is not in my whole Answer one such scurrilous or unclean Expression, as adorns his Title-page. But I can guess what he would be at; he would get out of this Dispute into calling Names, as being conscious wherein his strength lyes: but I do not intend to be so diverted, whatever may be fit, or just to be said of *him*, I know what is proper for *me* to say.

§ 2. I shall therefore wave those personal things, that must be very impertinent to the Reader; and consider those few places to which he produces any thing by way of Exception. The first and chief is that *pag. 25.* of mine Answer, Mr. M. had affirmed, that *Cranmer* drove on a Reformation against the major Vote of the *English Bishops*. To which I answered, *If by this he means establishing any thing without their Consent, 'Tis a notorious falsehood: for in all he did, he had the unanimous Vote and Consent of the major part of the Convocation, the universal Submission of the Clergy, and Approbation of the People. If they complied against their Conscience, then by this we may see, how excellently the Mass and Confessing had instructed them, in the Knowledge and Conscience of their Duty: when they so readily complied with all Alterations.* Mr. M. answers to this, first, by denying it with much assurance. And secondly, by denying its Sufficiency, if it had been

been so, to justify the Reformation. He pretends, that the whole strength of my Answer depends on this place ; p 4. To the Reader. and asks, *What shall become of his Answer to Mr. M. the whole strength whereof depends upon these words ?* Now in Answer to him I will shew, 1. That the whole strength of my Answer doth not depend on these words. 2. That they are certainly true, and consequently the Answer is good, if it did depend on them. And 3. I will return an Answer to what Mr. M. objects against their Truth.

First, Therefore the whole strength of my Answer doth not depend on these words; because I justified the Reformation through six foregoing pages in point of right and validity without them. I shewed, p. 21. that it is not impossible but the Pastours and Teachers of the People, appointed by God, may Teach False Doctrine ; and gave a plain Example from *Jer. 23.* and shewed farther that no Mission can justify false Doctrine, and that Popes themselves, when they have taught Heresie, have been deserted by their People, upon this account. Thus *Liberius* was deserted when he fell into Arianism and another received in his stead : Thus *Vigilius* upon the matter of the three Chapters ; and consequently where two Persons have both Ordination, which is the Mission of Christian Pastours, the People are to try their Mission by their Doctrine ; and not as Mr. M. affirms, p. 90. *the verity of their Doctrine by the certainty of their Mission.* For whoever gives a Man his Mission, if he teach any other Doctrine than Christs, though an Angel from Heaven, he is accursed : And this is St. *John's* advice, 2 Ep. 10. *If there come any unto you and bring not this Doctrine receive him not.* I shewed farther, p. 16. That the Episcopal Orders, conferred on our Bishops, empowered them to Administer all the Sacraments, and Teach all the Doctrines of the Reformation : Because those Sacraments, and Doctrines were Christs, not Theirs ; and I put Mr. M. upon it, to shew one Article, or Doctrine, or Sacrament, which the Reformers taught without a Commission. For since they had power given them to Teach all Christs Doctrines, and Administer all his Sacraments : He that would prove, that they have no Mis-

B 2
sion

sion to preach Doctrines, and Administer Sacraments according to the Institutions of our Church, must prove that those Doctrines and Sacraments are not Christs, or he proves nothing. This was what Mr. *M.* ought to have undertaken; but he has not so much as attempted it, and till it be done, the justice of the Reformation stands firm, and the validity of our Mission unshaken.

§ 3. But then, to justify the Reformation, not only in point of Right, but likewise in point of Regularity and Legality: I shewed that it was established by the same Regular Methods, by which other Constitutions were enacted in our Church; and this I shewed through p. 23, 24, 25 & 26. and particularly, those words against which Mr. *M.* excepts are brought in only to shew, that what *Cranmer* did in the Reformation was done in a *Regular way*.

§ 4. To demonstrate therefore in the second place, that those words are true, and consequently my Answer good, though it did depend on them, I will consider the several Steps of the Reformation: and shew how that neither in *Henry* the Eighth's time, nor in *Edward* the Sixth's, *Cranmer* established any thing, without the unanimous Vote, and consent of the major part of the Convocation. The steps in *Henry* the Eighth's time, were these: First, The establishing the Kings Supremacy; this was owned by the Convocation, in their Petition to the King, *Anno* 1531. two years before *Cranmer* came to the Archbishoprick. The

Vide Dr. *Burnet*,
Vol. 1. p. 112.

next step was forbidding Appeals to *Rome*; and declaring the Nation a compleat Body within it self, with full power to give Justice in all Cases, Spiritual as well as Temporal, *Anno* 1533. and this was likewise before *Cranmer* was Archbishop. The third Step was the Declaration concerning General Councils; agreeable to the 21 Article of our Church,

Doctor *Burnet*,
Vol. 1. p. 174. and
219. Col. 155

proposed first by some Bishops, *Anno* 1534. and after concluded in full Convocation, *Anno* 1536. The fourth step towards a Reformation was in the Articles published, *Anno* 1536. by the same Convocation, in which several points of Popery are laid aside, particularly our own Merits in the matter of Justification are disclaim'd, the Abuses of Pardons, the peculiar efficacy of Mas-

fes

ses said in certain places, and before certain Images, and the certainty of Purgatory, are all of them disowned. The fifth Step was the Translating the Bible into English; which was done at the Petition of the same two Houses of Convocation, *Anno* 1536. From which the Reader may judge, what truth there is, in what Mr. *M.* lays down as a Confutation of my whole Answer. *That all the English Bishops except a very few, (during the Reign of Henry the Eighth,) were utterly against Cranmers pretended Reformation* when these material points, were all of them settled in *Henry* the Eighth's time, without one Bishop, or Clergymans Dissenting from them as unlawful, (for ought appears) except *Fisher*: Whose Treasonable Tampering with the Maid of *Kent*, shews that his Judgment was no more infallible then his Neighbours: And Mr. *M.* cannot shew, in any of the Reformers, so wicked and treacherous an Artifice made use of to recommend or promote the Reformation, as this; which was contrived and carryed on by his *Anti Reformers*, to disgrace it by Counterfit Visions and Revelations. Let the Reader peruse Dr. *Burnet*, or rather the Act of Parliament, *Hen. 8. Anno 25. cap. 12.* And he will find that some of the Clergy set up that Impostor: that *Warham* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, Sir *Tho. Moore*, *Fisher*, and the Popes Orators encouraged her in her Treasonable Visions, and that the Popish Party in *Queen Mary's* time had some thoughts of Canonizing her: By which we may see what Arguments were then opposed to the Reformation, and with what kind of Men the Reformers had to deal.

§ 5. And as, all, that was done in *Henry* the Eighth's time, was done with consent of the Convocation; so the Reformation was established in *Edward* the Sixth's time, by the same Authority. It consisted of two steps; the first was the Service-Book, and the second, the Book of Articles. For the Service or Common-Prayer; the drawing it up was by Petition from the Convocation; as may be seen in Dr. *Burnet*, at the same time the Communion in both kinds, was agreed to by all the Convocation, without a contradictory Vote; and

p. 195.

p. 4. to the Reader.

Vol. 1. p. 149.

150. 151.

Coll. 123.

Vol. 2. p. 316.

coll. 286.

Vol. 2.

page 47.

like-

likewise the Marriage of the Clergy by the major part, 35 affirmatively, and 14 negatively.

*Ad Annum 1552.
p. 195. and in the
Collection, p. 209.*

As for the Book of Articles, that was likewise past in Convocation, as may be seen in *Dr. Burnet*, This is the sum of what was done by *Cranmer*, in all which he had, as I asserted, *the unanimous Vote of the major part of the Convocation, &c.*

§ 6. Let us now see (which is the third task I am to perform) what Mr. *M.* objects against this Assertion of mine. First, *To the Reader P. 4-* He tells us, that *almost all the Bishops under Edward the Sixth, were turned out of their Sees for dissenting from the Reformation*; but if this be all mistake and false, to return him his own words, *what shall we think of Mr. M's Confidence, thus imposing on his Readers? what shall become of his Reply to Mr. K. the whole or chief strength whereof depends on these words, that almost all the Bishops under Edward the Sixth were turned out of their Sees for dissenting?* This is matter of fact: and let the Reader judge, whether he or I have the greatest Confidence. In all the History of the Reformation, I can find only five Bishops turned out under *Edward the Sixth*, and not all those for dissenting. *Bonner* was the first, who was deprived *anno 1549.* but not for dissenting from the Reformation. For we are told by *p. 121* *Dr. Burnet*, that he complied so obediently with all the Laws and Orders of the Council, that it was not easie to find any matter against him: he executed every Order that was sent him so readily, that there was not so much as ground for any Complaint. The thing for which he was deprived, was for refusing to teach, that the King was no less King, and the People no less bound to obey, when he was in minority, than when he was of full age. This was the only ground of the Sentence against him, as may be seen, *p. 126.* And it is no point of the Reformation: but on the contrary it is the known and ancient Law of the Kingdom. *Gardiner* was deprived for the same Crime, *anno 1551.* but as for the Reformation, he declared, that *what Order soever were set out by the Kings Council, he should never speak against it, but to the Council themselves: and that* though

though he could not give consent to the Changes before they were made, he was now well satisfied to obey them. *Heath and Day* p. 165. were the next two, who were deprived: *Heath* for dissenting from the Book of Ordination, tho he opposed every thing done towards a Reformation, in Parliament, yet he had given an intire Obedience to it when it was enacted, which makes it probable, p. 143. that Conscience was not the ground of his dissent. *It doth not appear for what Day was deprived*, however deprived he was ann. 1552. The last that was turned out was *Tonstal*, not p. 203. for dissenting from the Reformation; but Misprision of Treason, ann. 1552. He had in all points given Obedience to every Law, and to all the Injunctions that had been made: but had always in Parliament protested against the Changes in Religion; which he thought he might with a good Conscience submit to and obey; tho he could not consent to them. These are all of the Popish party I p. 194. find turned out under *Edward the Sixth*. And let the Reader judge whether these five were almost all the Bishops, or whether they were turned out for dissenting from the Reformation. But some men have confidence enough to affirm any thing that makes for their purpose; as if their Religion consisted in Protestation against matter of Fact.

§ 7. But he objects further, that *Burnet* says, *Several* p. 5. To the Reader. of the Bishops under *K. Edward* submitted to the Reformation against their Consciences. He had done well to have told us where *Dr. Burnet* says so, for I, for my part, have not been so happy as to find it: he says indeed that several were against it: but doth not, that I can find, assign Conscience as the motive of their dislike. *Gardiner* professes, concerning the Book of Common Prayer, that tho he could not have made it in that manner, had He l. p. 99. the matter been referred to him; yet that he found such things therein, as did very well satisfy his Conscience: and therefore that he would, not only execute it in his own person; but cause the same to be officiated by all those of his Diocess. This seems to have been the general sense of the deprived Bishops, from what I have already quoted concerning them: and likewise from that Character given of them by *Dr. Burnet*. Others of the Bishops were ignorant p. 25.

and

and weak men ; who understood Religion little, and valued it less ; and so although they liked the old Superstition best, because it encouraged ignorance most, and that was the only support of their power and wealth, yet they resolved to swim with the stream. This shews that Doctor Burnet assigned their dislike to the Reformation to another Motive then Conscience ; and Mr. M. might

p. 83. have observed it, since he quotes this passage, but leaves out these words, *because it encouraged ignorance most, and that was the only sure support of their Power and Wealth.* By which the Reader may understand how faithfully he Transcribes Doctor Burnet. He had been told of this way of quoting, in my

p. 10, 11, Answer ; and 'tis not to be doubted, but if he could have 41. said anything in his own Defence, he would have said it : But instead of that, he perseveres in it ; perhaps to shew how resolute he is against all Reformation.

§ 8. But let us suppose several Bishops had complied against their Conscience ; it doth not follow from thence *that the Reformation was not the Act and Deed of the old Clergy*, which he infers : Mr. M. hath set down several Falshoods in his Catechism, suppose some be against his Conscience, doth it therefore follow that they are not his Act or Deed ? Let us put his own Case,

p. 5. to the Reader. *If the late Duke of Monmouth had prospered and then summoned an Assembly of the English Bishops to Reform the Church,* and only five had stood out against that Reformation, and the rest with the whole Clergy and people had submitted. I am of Opinion the Church of *England* must have answered for such a Reformation, and could never have cleared her self from the Guilt of such an *Act and Deed*. But, God be thanked, her Enemies have not, nor I hope, ever will have any such Crime to lay to her Charge.

§ 9. His third objection is, that if we read Burnet we shall find all Affairs dispatched by the Privy Council, and two Houses of Parliament, the Bishops generally Dissenting. I profess I can find no such thing, nor any Act past the Bishops generally Dissenting, for proof of this he adds out of Heylin, *That the Convocation was not empower'd in any publick business for ought appearing*

appearing on Record in the first year of King Edward, that is, anno 1547. But this is a mistake in *Heylin*, as appears from *Dr. Burnet*. He produces another place out of *Heylin*, notwithstanding the remove of so many Bishops, there remained one rub in the way, &c. therefore he would infer the Bishops generally dissented. But whoever will consult the place will find, that there were no more removed, than I have mentioned; only *Vesey* of *Exeter* resigned, pretending extream old Age. And this is far from the general Dissent of the Bishops; if all of these had dissented, as it is plain they did not.

*Vol. 2. p. 47.
and p. 50.*

p. 102.

*Dr. Burnet
p. 165.*

§ 10. His 4th Objection is, that in the year 1534. almost all the Churchmen were against *Cranmer*, as he alledges out of *Dr. Burnet*. Now if *Mr. M.* could shew any thing that *Cranmer* did then establish against their Vote and Consent, he would say something to the purpose. But the case is quite otherwise: *Cranmer* established nothing against their Consent; on the contrary, he yielded to them, not they to him. And this is observed by *Mr. M.* himself. Saith he, Anno 1540. *Cranmer* was for reducing the 7 Sacraments to 2, but the Popish party was prevalent; so the old number was agreed to. His Note on this is, that it was far from the unanimous Consent of the Clergy. Whereas on the contrary, it shews undeniably, that *Cranmer* waited the Consent of the Convocation; and, as became a modest man, submitted his Opinion to the major part. And this is not the only example of his humility & submission. But he tells us as from *Dr. Burnet*, that *Cranmer* subscribed with the rest tho against his own Opinion: whereas *Dr. Burnet* affirms the direct contrary in that very place, that *Cranmer* changed his Opinion, for he subscribed the Book. And this may be another example of *Mr. M.*'s Faithfulness in quoting. But this is modest to what he affirms, that *Cranmer* believed not a syllable, tho he subscribed with the rest, and that he durst not but subscribe for fear of King Henry. And all this without any probability or voucher; and which was impossible for any one to know, except he could know what was in *Cranmers* heart.

*pag. 82. om. of
Dr. Burnet.*

p. 82.

vol. 1.

p. 289.

p. 35.

Ad Ann. 1547. p. 47. vol. 2. § 11. His fifth Objection is, p. 83. from these words of Dr. Burnet; *While the Parliament was sitting, they were not idle in the Convocation, though the Popish party was yet so prevalent in both Houses, that Cranmer had no hopes of doing any thing, till they were freed of the trouble which some of the great Bishops gave them.* The thing to be proved from these words is, that Cranmer established something without the Consent of the major part of the Convocation: which can no way be inferred from them. All that can be concluded, is, that Cranmer expected great Opposition from some great Bishops; and no Reformation can ever be expected, but it will be opposed by some. But even this Convocation proved better than Cranmers hopes, and voted three very important points of the Reformation; the Alteration of the Service of the Church, the Communion in both kinds, and the lawfulness of the Marriage of the Clergy. Though he tells us from *p. 4. To the Reader.* Heylin, that it doth not appear that this Convocation was impowered to act.

p. 83. § 12 His 6th Objection is, that *ann. 1548. of the 8 Bishops who were ordered to draw up the Common Prayer Book 4 protested against it, as Dr. Burnet confesses, p. 94. vol. 2.* Now one would think that these words were all quoted out of Dr. Burnet: but I suppose the Reader by this time is aware how he trusts *p. 5. to the Reader.* Mr. M's Quotations. He *humbly desires his Good Reader, to set aside Prejudice and Interest, — which are but Pearles on both thine eyes that will hinder thy sight.* I believe he had some such Pearls on his eyes when he wrote this. For if we consult *p. 61. vol. 2.* Dr. Burnet, we shall find not 8, but 18, Bishops and 6 Divines appointed to examine the Offices of the Church. And *p. 94. It was said to be done by uniform Consent, though four of the Bishops that were employed in the drawing of it, protested against it, — but had agreed in the main parts of the work, though in some few particulars they were not satisfied, which made them dissent from the whole.* These are Dr. Burnets words, and let Mr. M. make the best of them for his Cause, he can. These four Bishops complied at last with the Book, which I will not suppose was against their

their Conscience, since a Man may protest against a thing for other reasons besides his thinking it unlawful.

His seventh Objection is from these words of Dr. Burnet, p. 62.
 where (speaking of the several Answers made to some Enquiries by the Bishops appointed to examine the Offices of the Church) ; he says, *that by those which are in the Collection, the Reader will perceive how generally the Bishops were addicted to the old Superstition, and how few agreed with Cranmer in all things.* But notwithstanding this, Cranmer established nothing wherein the generality did not agree ; for it was Cranmer's avowed principle, *to persuade the people rather by degrees to forsake their old mistakes, and not to precipitate things by an over hast.* And for his Warrant he vouched the Compliances that both Christ and his Apostles gave the Jews, when they were to abrogate the Mosaical Law. Dr. Burnet, page 61.

§ 13. The last Objection he produces against my Assertion, is the Protestation of 9 Bishops against the Bill for the Supremacy of Queen Elizabeth, Anno 1559. The Conclusion must be, if he intend it against me, that therefore Cranmer had not the consent of the major part of the Convocation. But Cranmer was burnt by some of these Bishops before this ; and therefore their Protestation could not concern him, or prove any irregularity in his proceeding. The Supremacy of the King in Spiritual Causes is a Temporal thing, as much as an Advowson of a Spiritual Living. It is inherent in the Crown : And some of these Bishops, that now protested against it, had not only Sworn it before, but also maintained it by invincible Arguments ; which I do not find they ever attempted to Answer. But here is the Case, Queen Mary burns five Bishops, and drives away eight more ; and after this, lays aside the Supremacy ; which, being a Prerogative of the Crown, could not be alienated. When things came to turn, Queen Elizabeth claims her Prerogative, the Parliament declares for it ; only 9 Bishops protest against it. Which to use the Queens own words in *Cambden, ad Annum, 1559. do now obstinately reject that Doctrine, which most of themselves under Henry the Eighth, and Edward the*

Sixth, *had of their own accord, with Heart and Hand, publicly in their Sermons and Writings taught unto others, when they themselves were not private Men, but publick Magistrates.* Now the question is, whether Queen *Elizabeth* could justly punish such disloyal subjects, by Imprisonment, or any other temporal Punishment? especially they having refused to Crown her; which was in effect to deny her Title to the Crown. Nay *Sanders* seems to say, that they refused to preside in their Churches, and rather resigned then were deprived; *Omnes recusarent Ecclesiis suis præesse in ea republica quæ à capite Catholicæ communionis defecisset. de visibili Monarchia, p. 662.*

§ 14. But to satisfy the Reader, how far the then Clergy were from thinking the Reformation unlawful; it is to be observed. 1. That though some Bishops in King *Edward's* time protested against it, while things were in agitation; they yet were content to be concluded by the Laws that were then made; and even the deprived Bishops, in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, acquiesced generally in their Deprivation, and lived peaceably with their Successors, without making any Schism, or keeping up a Succession against them: which they ought to have done, if they had believed them either Schismatics or Hereticks; and this is a probable Argument of what is commonly said, that it was Shame not Conscience was the ground of their Dissent, or as Doctor *Burnet* tells us, *The rather because they had lately declared so high for the Pope, that it had been indecent for them to have revolted so soon; only three of the fourteen who were deprived went over Seas.*

§ 15 Secondly. It is to be observed, that in *Edward's* the Sixths time, only five Bishops were deprived, and not all of them for dissenting: but in Queen *Mary's* time, 13 were laid aside, and that almost without further ceremony, than declaring their Sees void: and of these the burnt five. As for inferior Clergymen, I do not remember almost any in *Henry* the Eighth's time, or *Edward* the Sixth's, that refused to comply, or were deprived; whereas in Queen *Mary's* time, of 16000 Clergymen

Vol. 2.
p. 387.

Vid. Dr. Burnet,
p. 275.

Dr. Burnet 2 vol.
pag. 276.

men in *England*, 12000 were turned out. And yet in *Queen Elizabeth's* time, whereas *Burnet*, *Heylin* and *Cambden* reckon 9400 Beneficed-men, they agree that not above 189. left their Benefices on the account of Religion. This is a demonstration, what Opinion the generality of the Clergy at that time had of the Reformation; and shews, that either the old Clergy were exceedingly wicked and dishonest, or else that they thought the Reformation lawful.

Thirdly. It is to be considered, that the Clergy were the greatest losers by the Reformation: and therefore it could not be worldly Interest, that so generally inclined them to it.

Fourthly. Whoever considers the Severity on the Papists side against Dissenters, and yet the great numbers who dissented, and the mildness of the Reformers, and the small numbers that dissented from them; must allow, that the general Sense of the Clergy and People were for the Reformation. The Papists turned out and burnt Dissenters; the Reformers allowed them Pensions. And now let the Reader judge whether I imposed on him, when I said, that if, by driving on a Reformation, Mr. *M.* meant, establishing any thing without their Consent; 'twas a falshood: For in all *Cranmer* did, he had the unanimous Consent of the major part of the Convocation, the universal Submission of the Clergy, and Approbation of the People.

Dr. Burnet,
vol. 2. p. 400

C H A P. II.

§ 1. **B**UT Mr. *M.* has a second Answer, and that is by denying the Sufficiency of the Reformers Authority to justify the Reformation, if it had been as I have alledged. So, p. 87. *But supposing he had the major Vote of his side, ——— could that have justified his Reformation?* to which the Answer, is *not at all.*

To this I reply, that if the Doctrines established in the Reformation are false, or our Constitutions sinful, all the Votes in the world would not justify them; but if they are good, and agreeable to the Gospel, the Bishops by their receiving Power to
preach

preach the Gospel in their Ordination, received Power to preach the Reformation. The only Dispute therefore between us and the Church of *Rome*, is, whether the Reformation be agreeable to the Gospel? and if it be, how come the Bishops of our Church to want Power to preach it?

The sum of all that I can pick out of Mr. *M*'s Discourse, is reducible to this, That the Bishops, who reformed, in their Consecration promised Obedience to the Pope; and that the Power of Reformation was included neither in their Priestly nor Episcopal Orders. To give what he says the best face I can, I will put together his scattered Objections.

§ 2. Cranmer obliged himself, saith he p. 88. to pay *Fidelity, Subjection and Obedience to the Bishops of Rome in all things according to the Canons then in force, &c.* and upon these terms he received his Commission to go and preach the Gospel, — and besides he swore that Oath to the Pope, which you have heard, p. 28. of this Catechism; and then if all the Bishops had consented with him, they had but violated their Engagements and Vows, as Cranmer did, being all sent and ordained after that form.

To this I answer, That these Oaths are meer Innovations against the Practice and Sense of the ancient Church for a Thousand years at least, and of the greater part of the Catholick Church to this day; and for the proof of this I appeal to all the ancient Forms of Consecration, not one of which have the least intimation of such a Limitation or Condition in giving Orders, or sending men to preach; and therefore this being a new and unjust Imposition on persons ordained, it was a just Grievance, and fit to be redressed by a Reformation. But most of all that Oath which he mentions p. 28. of his Catechism was intolerable; which is plainly an Oath of Allegiance and Fealty to the Pope in Temporal things as well as Spiritual, and that as strict as can be sworn to any Temporal Prince: several Clauses in it are directly against some of the ancient Laws of these Kingdoms, particularly that Clause, *the Decrees, Ordinances, Sentences, Dispositions, Provisions and Commandments Apostolick, to my power I shall keep, and cause to be kept of others.* And lastly, It was invented by Pope *Paschal* with

with a design to cut off the Clergy from all dependence on their Princes, and therefore was in it self unlawful and void; and Mr. *M.* has more reason to conceal the Imposition of such a new and unlawful Oath, than to expect that the first Reformers should have kept it: or that their Orders which they received from Christ should have been limited by it. By it the Reader will see what Quarter Hereticks are to expect from Bishops that take or defend such an Oath to the Pope; one clause of it is, *Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and Rebels to our holy Father ——— I shall resist and persecute to my power.*

§ 3. But secondly, I suppose the true intent and design of Orders in all Churches is, to impower the person ordained to officiate as a Christian Bishop, Priest or Deacon; and therefore whatever promises or professions they make to submit to any persons; or whatever Subscriptions they make to any Articles, Doctrines, Decrees or Constitutions, they are obliged by them only so far as that Subscription or Profession consists with their Obligation to Christ and their Duty prescribed them in the Gospel: and if this be not so, I would desire Mr. *M.* to tell me what Salvo he hath for his Ordination Oaths, or for those he took and repeated so often, particularly at his Inductions and Installations? when therefore he tells us, that the first Reformers received their Commission to preach only on Condition that they preach'd the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church: I answer, That the first and indispensable Obligation in Orders is, even in the *Roman* Pontifical to preach Christs Doctrine; the secondary and new Obligation, which is but of yesterday, is, to obey the Pope and teach his Doctrines; but their Obligation to Christ is prior, and they are obliged to the Romish Doctrines only so far as those Doctrines agree with the Gospel.

§ 4. But he objects in the second place, to prove, that the power of Reformation was included in neither the Episcopal, nor Priestly Orders of the Reformers, page 87. *That they had no more Authority to abrogate the Mass, than the present Archbishop of Canterbury, with the major Vote of the Protestant Bishops to abolish the Common-Prayer, and by their Protestant Orders they cannot do it,* page 88. *that by his Consecration Cranmer had no more*

Autho-

Authority to preach the Doctrine of XXXIX Articles, then the present Archbishop of Canterbury to preach the Doctrine of the Council of Trent. To which I Answer, That the Orders conferred in our Church, empower a man to preach the Doctrine of Christ and Administer his Sacraments: and in as much as our Church is well assured, that her Articles and Constitutions are agreeable to the Gospel, she admits none into Orders that refuse to profess the same, or will not promise to preach accordingly.

But if Mr. *M.* can shew that in any thing they are contrary to Christ's Doctrines, or Commands; I will acknowledge that the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and the major part of the Bishops may not only alter and abolish such Doctrines or Constitutions, by virtue of their Orders, but in Conscience are bound to do it, as soon as they are convinced of their falshood or unlawfulness. and Mr. *M.* I believe is the only Man that I ever met with, who denied them the power to do it. Nay, if convinced that the Council of *Trent* were the Doctrine of the Gospel, they were obliged in Conscience to receive and Teach it. The true question therefore between us and the Papists is not about Mission, for the design of both Missions as derived from Christ is to preach his Doctrine; but the point is, whether the Council of *Trent*, or our Articles are most agreeable to that Doctrine: with which question, I find, Mr. *M.* has no great mind to meddle.

§ 5. But he objects thirdly, that *Cranmer* had no other Priesthood then what was given him by these words in the Pontifical, *Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses for the Living and Dead, and receive the Holy Ghost, whose Sins thou dost remit they are remitted, whose Sins thou dost retain, they are retained;* from whence he concludes, page 81. *that by his Priestly Orders he had received no power but to celebrate Mass for the Quick and Dead, and in Christ's name to bind and absolve Sinners, &c.* From this, I perceive that Mr. *M.* is of Opinion, that the whole Office and Commission of Priests consists in these words; and that Priests have nothing else to do but to say Mass, and absolve Sinners, upon Auricular Confession (I suppose.) But I would have the Reader observe, that these words were not said to any Priest.

Priest for near a Thousand years after Christ ; that none of the ancient Forms of Ordination have them ; that the greatest part of the Catholick Church do not use them at this day : and therefore there must be another Priesthood in the Christian Church then what is conferred by these words. But I had rather the Reader should learn this from *Morinus*, the learned Collector of the ancient Forms of Ordination than from me ; who passes this Censure on those that place the conferring of Priesthood in the words, produced by Mr. *M. Scholastici* ——— *ordinationum græcarum & antiquarum latinarum ignari, ea verba in Pontificali selegerunt quibus materia & forma Ordinationum affigerent, quæ in antiquis latinis Pontificalibus omnibus desunt, & posterioribus seculis à conciliis aut pontificibus addita sunt*, Exercit. 1. cap. 2. p. 12. that is to say, *Some School men being ignorant of the Greek and ancient Latine Ordinations, chose out some words in the Pontifical, and fixt the Matters and Forms of Ordination to them, which are wanting in all the ancient Roman Pontificals, and were added in latter Ages either by Councils or Popes.* Now let the Reader judge which had better Mission and Authority ; the Roman Church in latter Ages to bring in new matter and form of what they call a Sacrament ; or the Reformers to reject them. And whereas Mr. *M.* says, that *Cranmer* had no other Priesthood but what was delivered to him in these words, *Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God, &c.* This is a mistake : for altho the Roman Church has added of late these new Words & Priesthood, she yet retains the old Form and Words also. She describes the Priestly Offices to be those, *to Offer, Bless, Preside, Preach and Baptize :* After this the Bishop and Priests lay hands on those that are to be ordained, and then ordain them in that Form of Words, in which all the ancient Ordinations agree. *Oremus, &c. Let us pray, dear Brethren, Almighty God, that he would multiply his Heavenly Gifts on these his Servants, whom he hath chosen to the Office of Priesthood, &c.* In this, with some other Prayers, in which the ancient Rituals generally agree, are conferred the Orders of that Christian Priesthood which is warranted by

Sacerdotem
etenim oportet
Offerre, Bene-
dicere, præsse,
Prædicare, &
Baptizare, Pon-
tifical. Rom. in
Admon. ad Or-
dinandos.

the Gospel and ancient Church. By this Priesthood the Reformers were taught to Reform the Popish new Pontifical, and to reduce the Mass to a Communion as it was at first, which
 p. 81. Mr. M. calls *abolishing it*. They left it as much a *Sacrifice* as either the Scripture or ancient Church have taught it to be, and the *Communion-Table* as much an *Altar*, which fully justifies their Reformation. But the strangest Question that he proposes is, *By what Priesthood Cranmer reformed the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood into a Real Absence?* By which Question one would think Mr. M. had never read our Service, nor learnt our Catechism; since from both it is manifest that with the ancient Church we own a Real, though not Corporal or Local Presence of Christ: And that the Priest presents him to his Father in Commemoration of his Sacrifice on the Cross for the Sins of the World. All this our Evangelical Priesthood enables us to do: And I know not what more the Church of *Rome*, when strictly examined dares own, in what she calls a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice.

p. 82. If this be all the *blind-side of the Reformation* Mr. M. can find, any body may Answer all his wise Questions.

§ 6. It was upon account of these Orders of Priesthood retained still in the Pontifical, that I affirmed, p. 18. that *their Orders of Priest and Bishop are valid and capacitate a Man to perform all the Duties belonging to those Offices in a Christian Church.* — And charged the Popish Priests and Bishops not with want of Orders, but *abusing the Orders they have, to ill Intent and Purposes.* Now this he calls, *The wonderful Answer of Mas William King*; and asks, *by whose Authority I pass this Censure*: I answer by the Authority of the Scripture and ancient Church; to whose Faith and Offices they have plainly made these Additions: As appears beyond doubt to any one that compares the ancient Forms of Ordination with the new ones of the *Roman Church*. It is sufficient to us, that we find them neither owned by the Scriptures nor ancient Church: It is incumbent on them to shew their Authority to teach their new Doctrines: For whether they are True or False, we are not bound to receive them, till they produce their Authority to teach them.

The

The Gospel is every Bishops Commission : the Roman Bishops receive in their Ordination Power to preach the Gospel : They by vertue of this pretend to teach Transubstantiation, a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead, the half Communion, Purgatory, Prayers in an unknown Tongue, the Worship of Images and the Popes Supremacy. We ask then, where is their Commission to preach these things? Mr. *M.* produces the Pontifical ; we tell him, that is a late thing, and ask, who gave the Church of *Rome* Authority to make these new Doctrines, and put them into the form of appointing Christs Ministers? When they shew us this Authority, we will no more censure them for *exceeding their Commission*. But then let them remember, it is their task to shew their Mission, not ours to disprove it.

But Mr. *M.* objects in the 4th place, that I own *Roman Catholick Bishops are Christian Bishops, and their Orders* p. 90. *Christian Orders; and why then did the first Reformers so notoriously transgress them? — what needs any more to recommend their Doctrine than Christian Bishops and Christian Mission?* To which I answer; That when he proves that the first Reformers transgressed their Orders so far as they were Christian, we will own that they did amiss ; but he has said nothing to prove that : and therefore we shall think them innocent, till he prove his Accusation. There needs a great deal more to recommend a mans Doctrine, besides Ordination to be a Christian Bishop. *Paulus Samosatenus* was a Christian Bishop, and had Christian Mission, I hope Mr. *M.* doth not think this was sufficient to recommend his Doctrine. A Christian Bishop while he keeps to his Christian Mission, that is, preaches the Gospel, keeps within his bounds : and every body is bound to hear him at his peril. But if he preach that for Gospel which is no part of it, his Mission cannot warrant him, or oblige his Hearers to believe him.

§ 7. He objects in the 5th place, (though not in direct words, yet in such as are equivalent) that every one is obliged to preach the Doctrine of his Ordainers; and since all the Reformers were ordained by Roman Catholicks, therefore they had no Authori-

ty to preach any other Doctrine: This is indeed the strength of all he says about Mission; and in answer to it, I replied, *That every man is not ordained to preach the Tenets of his Ordainers; and that such as are ordained are no more accountable to their Ordainers upon the account of being ordained by them, than a man is accountable to a Lord Chancellour for the use of his Power, because he set the Seal to his Patent, by which he claims his Power.* This Mr. M. calls an admirable passage, p. 90 and desires his Reader to mark it, p. 91. where he again repeats it. But there is nothing admirable or remarkable in it, besides its plain unquestionable Truth, which destroys utterly all Mr. M's Discourse of Mission, and therefore it concerned him highly to confute it. I shall consider the Arguments he brings against it, and leave it to the Reader to determine whether they could be so much as intended in good earnest for a Confutation. His first Argument is, *That then if Mr. K. were* pag. 91. *ordained by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, or Tuam, he is not accountable to them for his Doctrine.* To which I reply, That I do not look on my self to be accountable to my Ordainers on the account of being ordained by them, but because I live within their Jurisdiction. If I had been ordained by another Bishop (as in truth the Bishops that ordained me are both dead) I were never the less or more accountable to the Archbishop of Dublin whilst I live in his Diocese: and if I lived in another Province, or Kingdom, I should look on my self accountable to the Catholick Bishops of that place, and not to him, tho he had ordained me. The Pope is consecrated by the Bishop of *Osia*, is he therefore accountable to him for his Doctrine? A man must have a greater degree of Sagacity than is common, who is capable of writing such things.

§ 8. The 2^d Argument he produces to prove, that every one is obliged to preach the Tenets of his Ordainers. is, because our Saviour himself says, *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me,* Joh. 7. 16. It is hard to find where the strength of this Argument lies; The Jews, in the 15th verse, *marvelled, saying, how knoweth this man Letters, having never learnt?* To which our Saviour answered, *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me;* which gives

gives a reason how our Saviour was able to teach without learning any thing from men; even because he was inspired by God his Father. But how doth it follow from hence, that every one is obliged to preach the Tenets of his Ordainers? *Felix* was ordained Bishop of *Rome*, and *Meletius* of *Antioch* by the *Arians*, and *Anatolius* of *Constantinople* by the *Eutychians*; were these bound to preach the Tenets of their Ordainers, because our Saviours Doctrine was not his, but his that sent him? were the *Donatists*, *Novatian*, *Meletian*, nay *Arian*, *Eutychian*, *Nestorian*, *Monothelite* Bishops all obliged to teach their Ordainers Tenets? then the Catholick Church was in a great error, when she admitted such to their Honours and Offices, without new Ordination, upon their renouncing the Tenets of their Ordainers.

§ 9. His third Argument against this Assertion of mine is, pag. 91. That I may prove a shrewd man, if I live, and set up for a new Reformer; — a man may receive Orders from the Church of England, and afterwards make a step to New England, and there preach against Common Prayer by vertue of this Assertion. To which I reply, When Mr. *M.* convinces me, that there is a necessity of a new Reformation, I hope, I shall not be backward in my station to do my endeavour to promote it. And when he proves any thing false or sinful in the Common Prayer Book, I shall look on my self not only impowered, but obliged by my Orders to endeavour to amend it in a regular way. In the mean time I am fully satisfied and ever have been with the Constitutions, Articles and Service of our Church. I believe Schism and Heresie, to be great sins; and that God will call them to a severe account who are guilty, and the fear of this account to God is all the Obligation from Christ, that I know, which any Church has on her Members to keep them in her Communion, and believe Mr. *M.* can shew no other, except it be the Obligation of the *holy Office of the Inquisition*. And so let the Reader judge whether Mr. *M.* has proved what so much concerns him, that every man is bound to preach the Doctrine of his Ordainers.

§ 10. In the mean time I will proceed to a sixth Objection, which is in these words, *Mr. King allows Roman Catholicicks*
 p. 90. *Mission and denies their Doctrine, they deny both his Mission and Doctrine, when Doctrines are disputed, and Scriptures alledged by both parties, how shall a Church prove the verity of her Doctrine, but by the certainty of her Mission?* To this I Answer, That if by Mission to Teach be here meant a Commission, or Authority; I absolutely deny that the *Roman* Bishops have any Commission from Christ to Teach their Popish Doctrine. If they have, let them produce it. We produce the Bible, and our Saviours Commission given us in our Ordination to teach every Article of our Faith; and so far as their Orders agree with this, we own them. But where is their Mission to Teach their Popish Doctrine? Mr. M. produces the Pontifical, but that is a late thing, as I have shewn, and has no Authority or Appointment from Christ. It is not agreeable to the sense of the Catholick Church of the primitive Ages, nor of this present Age. Let therefore Mr. M. prove the certainty of their Mission to preach those Doctrines which the Reformers rejected, and Protestants will yield them the Cause. But let him not mistake a general Mission to teach Christ's Doctrine for a Mission to preach the Council of *Trent*, before he has proved the Doctrine thereof to be Christ's: Nor vouch the Roman Pontifical of a few years standing for the Voice of Christ, or of the Catholick Church.

§ 12. He brings in the example of Christ, who, he says,
 p. 90. *appealed to the Evidence of his Mission, when askt, by what Authority dost thou these things?* that is to say, (if we believe Mr. M.) when our Saviour was asked what Mission he had, he appealed to the Evidence of his Mission. But our Saviour did no such thing: he never was guilty of such a Circle, nor went about to prove his Mission by his Mission: On the contrary, he produced three substantial Arguments to prove his Authority; the first was, his Miracles. Say the Jews in *St. John* 10. 24. *if thou be the very Christ tell us plainly.* To which he Answers, v. 25. *The works that I do in my Fathers name they bear witness of me.* The second was, the Scripture, *John* 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, — and they*

they are they that testifie of me. The third is the Innocency, Power and Purity of the Doctrines themselves, meant by the *Water and Blood* that together with the *Spirit* bear witness in earth. 1 Joh. 5. 8. By these 3 our Saviour proved his Mission, and we are able to prove all the Articles of our Religion by the same; since they are no other then the common Articles of Christianity, if the Church of *Rome* will but prove her superadded Doctrines by the same Arguments, we will own her Commission to teach them.

§ 12. But then he objects in the last place, *I would fain know who shall be Judge?* To which I Reply, I would as p. 90.
fain know as he. We have desired long and pressed them to produce this visible living Judge; but we do not yet find themselves agreed concerning him. This Question supposes that in matters of belief there must be a Judge: Now I desire that Mr. *M.* (or somebody else who is better able) would be at the pains to prove that there is such a Judge, and shew who he is; and then tell us, who shall be Judge, whether we ought to believe the proofs produced sufficient to demonstrate the necessity, and shew us the person of this Judge: Mr. *M.* Appeals to the *indifferent Reader*, but who shall be Judge of his indifference? Nay, if the Reader p. 90.
must be trusted to judge for himself at his peril in all these Cases, why may he not be trusted in matters of much less moment?

§ 13. I have shewn in my Answer, p. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82. how far every Man is to submit his belief to the Catholick Church, or particular Church where he lives, to which Mr. *M.* has made no reply: I shewed that the Church was not a Judge to determine Doctrines for Christ, but a witness of what Christ taught; and I shewed how far we ought to believe her Testimony: Her Authority is such a motive to belief as the Testimony of an honest sincere witness is to a Jury to believe matter of Fact. But there are some Motives of belief stronger and more certain than all the Authority or Witnesses in the World; and of this every man's own Reason and Sense is Judge: He may believe or not believe at his own peril. If he believe a Church, 'tis because his Reason or Sense tells him, that he ought to believe her. When therefore any one comes with
pre-

pretence of a Mission to preach any Doctrine, he must allow every Man to examine his Commission. Whether he have one, and how far it empowers him to teach before he can expect to be received: and of this every Man is likewise Judge at his peril: if he receive a Man without examining his Commission, or reject one who has a Commission, he must Answer it to God, who will Judge every Man according to the Talent he gave him. If any mistake through invincible ignorance, we hope God will forgive him, but if through Negligence or Willfulness he falls into Error, he may Perish for his Negligence or Willfulness, but not for his Error. It concerns therefore all who would save their Souls, to examine the claims of the several Pretenders, and to chose not those whose pretences are highest, but whose grounds are most agreeable to Sence, Reason and Scripture.

§ 15. And this gives a clear Answer to what I find urged as the chief Argument for the necessity of a Visible Guide and Judge of Controversies, which is taken from the goodness of God, who is supposed incapable of leaving men to any uncertainty in Religion, where Errors may be damnable. But if no Error can be damnable, that is not willful in some degree; then the goodness of God is not obliged infallibly to preserve us from any Error: for God is sufficiently good, if he either give us an infallible way to preserve us from Error, or Pardon us when we fall unavoidably into it: for either way, if we be but diligent and do our duty our Salvation is secured. Thus Protestants that are sincerely honest and diligent, are certain to be saved without an infallible Judge of Controversies; and therefore all the Arguments for such a Judge drawn from the goodness of God are inconclusive.

§ 15. I observe further, that Mr. M's way of Reasoning, and their's that with him are for an absolute submitting our Reason in matters of Belief to the Guides of the present visible Church, excuses the Jews for not believing *John Baptist* or our Saviour, as much as those Papists who without examination reject the Reformation; for the Scribes and Pharisees, the Priests and Elders, were the Governours of the Jewish Church, and pretend-
ed

ed as much to govern her, as Christian Bishops pretend to govern the Christian Church ; and indeed their Commission and Promises are as plain to secure them from Error, as those given to the Christian Bishops ; and the People as much obliged to depend on their Mouths for the Interpretation of the Law, as Christians to learn the Gospel from Christian Priests. Now *John Baptist* came baptizing and preaching the Doctrine of Repentance, the Governours of the Jewish Church send to him, *S. Job. i. 19. to ask who he was, and why he baptized?* To whom he answered, by shewing his Commission out of the Prophet *Isaiah chap. 40.* without any Miracle. The Rulers and Governours of the Jews, to whom the Interpretation of Scripture belonged, thought this insufficient, and rejected him. Now here *St. John* interpreted the Scripture one way, and the Jewish Church another way ; I ask whose Interpretation the People ought to follow, and who should be Judge ? If they had all been of *Mr. M's* Opinion, as indeed too many were, they must have rejected the *Baptist*. For *St. John* could not deny their Mission, but they denied both his Mission and Doctrine, and when Doctrines are disputed, and the Scriptures alledged by both parties, how shall a Church prove the verity of her Doctrine, but by the certainty of her Mission ? saith *Mr. M.* but the Jews believed *St. Johns* Scripture Testimony against their Priests and Spiritual Governours Interpretation, and did well in it : Therefore some Texts of Scripture are so plain that the people are bound to believe them even against the Interpretation of the visible Church.

§ 16 Nay the same holds of our Saviour, he came teaching the Doctrine of the Kingdom of Heaven, and to prove it he vouches Scriptures and Miracles : the Priests and Rulers contend that he misapplies Scriptures, and quote others against him ; and as for his Miracles they deny their Evidence ; what shall the people do ? Our Saviour owns the Scribes and Pharisees Mission, they sat in *Moses's* Chair, but he denies their Doctrine ; they deny both his Mission and Doctrine. Now *Mr. M's* resolution is, that the verity of the Doctrine is where there is certainty of Mission. If it be objected, that our Saviours Miracles vouched

sufficiently his Mission and Doctrine. I answer, this depends on the resolution of three Questions; 1. Whether our Saviour did any Miracles? 2. Whether his Miracles were from the Power of God? and 3. Whether, if they were from God, they might not be to try the Fidelity of his People? Now I would fain know who should be Judge of these three Questions? Our Saviour could not be admitted Judge, because a man must be satisfied in them, before he could be satisfied of our Saviours Authority. If the Governours of the visible Church be allowed to judge them, we find they determined, at least, the last two against our Saviour: and therefore there must either be no Judge at all, or each man must be Judge for himself at his peril; and to his hearers our Saviour appealed, *Luk. 12. 57. and why even of your selves judge ye not what is right?* But notwithstanding the Determination of the Guides of the Church, the People believed in our Saviour, and resolved the former Questions against their Guides: and therefore some Questions may be so plain that a man ought to determine them for himself, even contrary to the Resolution of the Church. If it be objected, that the Scriptures foretold a Messiah, and that the Jews would reject him: and therefore when he came the People were at liberty to receive him, notwithstanding the Sense of their Rulers to the contrary. I answer, who was to interpret these Scriptures? if the People, and not their Guides; then why may not Christian people be as well trusted with Interpretation of Scripture, as the Jews? but where was this liberty given the Jews? where was their Mission to interpret Scripture contrary to the Sense of their Priests, from whose Mouth they were obliged to *inquire the Law?* From all which it is plain, that this setting up an infallible Guide and Judge in the Church was the very reason of the Jews rejecting our Saviour, as it is now of the Papists rejecting the Reformation. And if the Authority of the visible Guides of the Church are to be believed before all other Arguments of Sense and Reason, the Jews were in the right when they believed the Scribes and Pharisees who sat in *Moses's Chair*, and their Interpretation of Scripture, rather than the plain Texts and Miracles our Saviour

viour and the Apostles produced for their Mission.

§ 17. There is another passage, against which Mr. *p. 58. of my Answer.*
M. excepts, and 'tis that I say *the Idolatry with which we charge the Church of Rome is not inconsistent with the being of a Church, or Succession of Bishops,* which I shewed through the 58, 59, 60, and 61. pages, and answered all that he had produced to prove *th m* inconsistent. Now he neither attempts to invalidate my Arguments, nor defends his own. From whence the Reader will be apt to think, that he gives those Arguments up as indefensible. However, it seems, though the passage could not provoke him to give an Answer (for a good reason I suppose;) yet it made him very angry; for he falls to calling Names upon it: *He tells me that I am Preacher of Saint War-* *p. 59.*
burghs Dublin, a young man; that is, about 21 years standing in the University, and of *profound Learning,* which is all the Answer I must expect from him. But to do him justice, though he doth not defend his former Arguments, he yet supplies them with a new one, and 'tis this, *The 19th Article of our Church tells us, ' that the visible Church of Christ is a Congregation* *p. 59.*
' of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached and the ' Sacraments duly administred, according to Christs Ordinance, in all ' those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. Now (saith Mr. *M.*) tell me ingenuously, whether you think Mr. K's Charge of Idolatry is consistent with such a visible Church of Christ? and where that visible Church dwelt upon the face of the earth before the Reformation? The fault of this Argument is, that there is no connexion between the Premises & Conclusion. For let the Reader try, if he can find out any thing in this Definition to secure a Church from the practice of Idolatry, more than of any other corruption? May not a Church preserve the Bible and Creeds which contain the pure Word of God, and administer the Sacraments in all their Essentials, and yet give some part of that Honour to a Creature which God has reserved for himself; or ask those things of Creatures that God only can give? which is the Idolatry with which the Church of *Rome* stands charged. May not some Laws of a Kingdom encroach on the Kings Prerogative, but it must immedi-

ately cease to be a Kingdom? may not a City which has power to make by-laws, through inadvertency or ignorance, make some contrary to the general Laws of the Kingdom, but they must immediately cease to be Members of it? and may not a man protest against their illegal Constitutions or Practices, but he must immediately forfeit his right in the Corporation? and yet this is the force of all those Arguments Mr. *M.* brings to prove that according to the Sense of the Reformers the Catholick Church was in *Utopia*, and that the Reformers died members of no Church, because they protested against such Corruptions as had crept into some particular Societies that were members of the Catholick Church. When Mr. *M.* lays the weight of his Cause on such Arguments, he would tempt one to suspect, either that he plays booty with his new Church, or else that his design is to weary me with things nothing to the purpose, and ill language: for he tells me, *that I have enough to do (and perhaps more than an ingenious man would desire to undertake)* if he be of Mr. *M.*'s humour, *to satisfy the itching ears*, who told him this, *of my Congregation with a spick and span new Sermon every Sunday in the year, besides other Parochial Duties*; which construed is only this: Mr. *K.* is a strange man, cannot he find business enough in his Cure, but he must be spoiling my Considerations? Well, since my Reasons or Considerations cannot do it, I am resolved to rail him into silence, and find him work enough one way or other, no matter how, But let not Mr. *M.* flatter himself; whatever my business be, I shall find by Gods help leisure enough to let the world see what strength there is in his Writings; though he take all the pains he can to save me that labour, by making them such that the meanest Reader may perceive it without my shewing.

§ 18. He produces two places more, one as an instance of *Modesty*, and the other of *Loyalty*; but has not shewn us wherein the Immodesty or Disloyalty consists; and I shall leave it to the Reader to find it out if he can. And for his promise, that it shall *appear in the second Part of his Catechism*, I shall only return him my promise, to give him all the Consideration he deserves.

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

§ 1. **A**S to the Vices he charges on the Reformers, I would desire the Reader to consider, that most of them were only dregs and remains of the Principles and Practices of the Papists of that age, from which the Reformers had not intirely freed themselves.

Thus *Henry* the eighths Cruelty in burning such as denied the Six Articles, was agreeable to the Laws and Principles of Popery, and his fault is only not reforming those Laws and Principles as well as other things. We see by this how ill Papists like their own resemblance in *Henry* the Eighth.

His high opinion and conceit of his Learning were bred in him by the Flatteries of the Popish party; first of the Pope, and secondly by his Favourites in *England*, who made this the very engine whereby they prevented the Kings proceedings in the Reformation; as may be seen, *Burn.* 1 vol. p. 172. and p. 254. and many other places.

Thirdly. His condemning men without confronting Witnesses, which is one of the greatest blemishes of his Reign, was copied from the Inquisition, where this practice is common; which being a holy Court, no wonder if he thought it excusable to imitate its proceedings.

Fourthly. His Luxury, for which he had two eminent Cardinals his examples, *Wolsey* and *Campegio*, the Popes Legates. I do not find that this was reckoned such a crime by the then Clergy, but that a man might be a good Son of the Church, and capable of the Guidance of the holy Ghost notwithstanding it.

§ 2. And as *Henry* the eighths faults were only reliëts of the Principles or Practice of the then Papists, so the same is in great measure true of *Cranmer*: He is charged with burning Hereticks. Now this was by Laws made by Papists. He had the universal Practice of the Church of *Rome* for his Warrant, and even of their Saints and Martyrs: witness *Dominick*, Sir *Thomas More* and
Fisher

Fisher, who are noted for their Excesses in this kind ; this wicked

Dr. Burnet , Principle *Cranmer* reformed only in part, having confined it directly to Errors against the Apostles Creed.
2 Vol. p. 111.

Whereas Papists extend it to all the Doctrines of their Church.

Secondly, 'Tis objected by Mr. *M.* and *Cranmers* Accusers at *Oxford*, that he took his Oath with a Protestation, and this was likewise a Popish practice warranted by their Casuists and Canonists: And *Cranmer's* fault was complying with them, which shews how much the Casuistical Divinity of that time needed Reformation. All other Bishops did in effect the same, Swearing one Oath to the Pope, and an inconsistent Oath to the King. As may be seen in *Dr. Burnet Vol. 1. page 123, and 124.* The only difference is, that others swallowed these without making any Bones of them ; whereas *Cranmer* would not do it without making his Protestation, and signifying in what sense he Swore to the Pope ; that is, only as the Laws of the Kingdom allowed his Power : Which was not as Mr. *M.* slanders him, p. 29. to Swear not to observe one Syllable of it.

Thus when he observes that the King was married to *Ann Boleyn* before the Divorce, p. 29. he forgets that this was agreeable to the Popes advice. Now these Vices are to be

Dr. Burnet,
p. 49.

reckoned the Vices of the Age and Time, not of the Reformation, and it is very unreasonable for Papists to tax Protestant Reformers with their own Faults and Vices; meerly because they had not yet quite recovered themselves from them.

§ 3. *Secondly*, I observe, That Mr. *M.* requires some special Commission or Inspiration in every body that undertakes to Reform a corrupted Church ; and therefore he calls the few Reformers he mentions, *Apostles and Evangelists of the Reformation.* And then pretends, that they must shew some extraordinary Evidences of that Mission in their Lives ; but when he comes to observe those, he passes over all their Virtues, and only picks out what he thinks to have been bad in them : which is just as if one pretending to give account of *Noahs* Commission to preach Righteousness, should pitch on his Drunkenness as the only Evidence

dence of it ; or on *Moses* killing the Egyptian ; and *Aaron's* Sacrificing to the Calf ; *Ferubbaals* setting up an Image ; *Sampsons* Lusts ; *Dauids* Adultery and Murther ; *Solomons* Idolatry ; or *Saint Peters* denying his Master, for Evidences of their being raised up by God. I desire therefore the Reader to look over the History, and compare those who were for the Reformation, with such as opposed it; and let him say in his Conscience, which seems to have had the truest sense of God and Religion: and not to take their Character from the mangled and broken account Mr. *M.* gives of some of them.

§ 4. *Thirdly*, I observe that Mr. *M.* gives a very unfair and inaccurate account of most of the things he presents us. For instance he charges *Cranmer* with some Heterodox Opinions, p. 32, 33, 34. Whereas it appears from Doctor *Burnet*, by three Arguments, that *Cranmer* of his own accord renounced those Opinions. *First*, Because he signed *Robertsons* and *Leightons* Resolutions given in at the same time ; which shews he upon sight liked them better then his own. *Secondly*, Because he subscribed the publick Doctrine directly contrary. *Thirdly*, Because when he set out a Catechism, he contradicted them. *It is plain saith Doctor Burnet*, *That he had now quite laid aside those singular Opinions which he formerly held of the Ecclesiastical Functions ; for now, in a work which was wholly his own, without Concurrence of any others, he fully set forth their Divine Institution.* Mr. *M.* takes notice only of the second of these Arguments of *Burnets*, and very charitably concludes, p. 35. *that by what he subscribed it can never be gathered that he quitted those strange Opinions.*

Vide Dr. Burnet, Coll. p. 243. Vol. 1. Hist. Vol. 1. p. 289.

Vol. 2. p. 71.

Thus p. 82. he asserts, that we read *Communion-Service* without a *Communion* upon most *Sundays* and *Holydays*, which is absolutely false, and seems unaccountable in one that was so long a Clergy-man in our Church ; for the Service peculiar to a Communion is never read in our Church but when the Communion is celebrated, tho' it is in the Roman Mass, as I shewed, p. 63.

Thus he brings the Dispute concerning the Kings Supremacy
on

on the stage, p. 64, 65, 66. and *Fishers* Speech, p. 97. both which represent it as if our Kings challenged the Power of the *Keys*: which they never did, as appears from the Books written

at the time when the King put it in his Stile. The
Burnet vol. 2. same is manifest likewise from our Articles and con-
 p. 141, 142. stant Doctrine of our Divines, who never extended the

Kings Power in Spirituals further than the Coertion of the Sword: that is, to punish a person for a spiritual crime by some temporal punishment, such as Imprisonment or Fines, Deprivation or Suspension from the Secular Advantages that accompany Spiritual Function: And therefore the Notes of the Conference, or rather Sentencing of *Cranmer*, at *Oxford*, which are related p. 51. in Mr. *M*'s Catechism, that make *Cranmer* assign both the *Sword and Keys to the King*, must needs be false; and *Fox*'s censure true, that *the Notary reported the thing otherwise than it was*. And the Reader may observe, that when *Cranmer* explained the Supremacy as Protestants hold it, and as it is explained in our Articles, that by it is meant no more than that all persons Ecclesiastical as well as Temporal are subject to the King, and that *the King is Governour of all his people, which are the visible Church*; Dr. *Martin* the Archbishops Opponent hath nothing to say, but
 pag. 66. *you never durst tell the King so*: which was a manifest falshood. To what purpose then did Mr. *M*. bring such unfair Representations on the stage, but to stuff out a Book?

Thus *Cranmer* alledges, that in the matter of the Sacrament, a number of Doctors or Fathers were against Papists, and not one for them; the Bishop of *Glocester* produces two, pag. 73. one of them speaks indeed to the purpose, that is *Cyprian de Cæna Domini*: but then this Piece is a notorious Counterfeit, and owned not to be St. *Cyprians* Work by *Bellarmino*. The true Author of that and the rest of the pieces *de Cardinalibus operibus Christi*, is *Arnoldus Abbas bonæ Vallis*, who lived near a thousand years after St. *Cyprian*. Now I dare appeal to the Reader, whether such a Forgery in a Protestant would have past without a remark of Mr. *M*'s; but that and the rest of that Bishops Speech are much of a piece.

Thus

Thus, p. 6. he affirms, *that never any Pope had the wickedness to do such things as the Reformers did*, which shews he never read their Lives. *Alexander the sixth* alone was guilty of more wickedness than all the Reformers; of Simony, Lust, Rapine, publick and private Murders, Poysoning, dilapidating the Goods of the Church and giving them to his Bastards. *Platin. in vit.*

Thus he asserts, *p. last.* that his Dialogue contains the *History of the Reformers and Anti-Reformers*. Whereas he has not said one word of the half of either party. It contains only a History of the Mistakes or supposed Mistakes of some Reformers; which is rather an Accusation than History; and in as much as a great many things are forged, 'tis a Libel.

Nay, so strangely is he carried away with partiality, that he commends the most wicked and horrid Opinions of Popery. Thus he commends Dr. *Edgworth*, pag. 34. for asserting, that though a man be *not sure whether his Contrition, Attrition or Displeasure for his sins be sufficient to satisfy Almighty God* — yet he may be sure by Absolution by the Priest. — *If he do not then sin inwardly or outwardly, but intend to receive what the Church intends to give him by Absolution.* If this be all that is required of Romish Penitents, Repentance is a very easie thing amongst them: yet Mr. *M.* wishes *Cranmer had half the Honesty or Piety of this Casuist.* But, I say, God forbid there should be found one such wicked Principle amongst all the Reformers; or one such Betrayer of Souls as to maintain it. If we should charge the Church of *Rome* with such a Doctrine, what Clamours should we hear concerning Misrepresenting?

§ 5. I will give but one instance more of his unfairness, and that is, p. XI. he observes from Dr. *Burnet*, that the Record of the Sentence annulling *Ann Bolens* Marriage with the King is burnt. Now on this his Note is, *that the Record of the Sentence — be sure, was not burnt by the Enemies, but Friends of Queen Elizabeth*, by which he would insinuate that Protestants used that wicked art of embezzelling Records, which the Papists cannot deny that they practised in *Queen Marys* time. But these Records, the loss of which Dr. *Burnet* frequently laments, were destroy-

ed, as he himself tells us, p. 93. vol. 2. in the *Fire of London*. I dare not impose on my Readers patience so far as to go thorow the several false inferences and impertinent Quotations in his Book: how little accuracy is to be expected from him appears from his charging *Cranmer with coyning Nine and Thirty Articles, and imposing them on the Clergy*, pag. 25. whereas every body knows, that the XXXIX Articles were drawn up and imposed by the Convocation, anno 1562. six years after *Cranmer* was burnt; the Articles agreed on by the Convocation, Anno 1552. in *Crammers* time, were not 39, but 42.

But to proceed; let any one observe the Reformers, and he will find, that their faults were not such as use to proceed from a false or malicious mind; such as the villanous contrivance of the Maid of *Kent*, to grace Popery by counterfeited Visions & Revelations; *Dr. Burn.* or the Murther of *Hunne* in secret for legally opposing the
 P. 14. Power of the then Clergy: but they are such as commonly proceed either from frailty, imprudence or indiscreet zeal: and are generally consistent with an honest heart. And Mr. *M.* doth frequently make those to be Vices, that are none at all: as when, p. 76. he makes the distinction between Licencing a Sin and not Punishing it a piece of *Knavery*, which yet every body knows may be very honestly done, and in some cases is necessary.

§ 6. But lastly, I observe that the very foundation of all his Discourse is unsound and false. This foundation he lays down in his first paragraph to the Reader; where he tells us, that *he who would shew us a new and better way to Heaven, than either we or our forefathers have been acquainted with, ought in all reason to recommend himself (as the Apostles did) by some other Authority then a bare pretence of Scripture, which every body claims as well as he ——— and that Cranmer was this new undertaker.* In which there are as many Mistakes, to say no worse, as Sentences. For, first, it is false, that *Cranmer* undertook to shew us a new or better way to Heaven, than either we or our forefathers had been acquainted with: since our forefathers were acquainted with that very way that *Cranmer* shewed us. All that he did, was, to bring us back to the way of our forefathers, from which some out of
 worldly

worldly Interest, or through Ignorance, had strayed ; and blended the Religion of the ancient Church with many Corruptions. The alteration between the Practices of the ancient Church and the Roman, being in many things so visible, that their learned men have not had the Confidence to deny it. The Corruption of Indulgences have been owned even by the Pope, Cardinals and Bishops. Transubstantiation is owned by many learned Men not to have been an Article of Faith before the *Lateran* Council. The Communion in one kind is commanded even by a Council, with a *Non obstante* to the institution of our Saviour, and the practice of the primitive Church. Who can affirm, that our Fathers in *Ireland* owned the Popes Supremacy, the Sacraments of Confirmation, Confession or Marriage : Who either knew nothing of them, or neglected them before the time of *Malachias*, near twelve hundred years after our Saviour : as Saint *Bernard* assures us, in *Vita Malachie*. Whereas in our Reformation, there is not one Article or Doctrine required as of Faith, or practice, as necessary ; but what are as old as the Christian Religion ; but what were believed by our Forefathers ; but what are owned by the Catholick, nay *Roman* Church.

§ 7. But *Secondly*, 'Tis false that he who would shew a Man a better way to Heaven then he or his Forefathers knew, must have a better Authority then Scripture. He that convinces a Heathen of the truth of Scripture, and teaches him the Christian Religion, shews him a better way then he or his Forefathers knew ; and yet needs no such Mission as the Apostles had, nor indeed any other Mission then his own Conviction ; and the same may be said of him that converts a Heretick by Scripture.

Thirdly, It is false that *Cranmer* had only a bare pretence to Scripture. He had the Office of a Christian Bishop and Metropolitan of a National Church to warrant him in Reforming that Church ; he had the unanimous Vote, as I have demonstrated, of the major part of the Convocation, with the submission of the Clergy and people in all he established ; he had also the practice of the primitive Church and suffrages of the Fathers on his side ; and in many things the practice and approbation of a considerable part of the
pre-

present Church; he coined no new Articles of Faith, nor made new Creeds. And this is much more then a bare pretence to Scripture.

But *Fourthly*, 'Tis false that *every body claims Scripture as well as he*. The Church of Rome is so far from claiming it as well as he, that she disclaims it's being her only Rule; and is forced to call in the unwritten word to help it. She dare not Translate and put it to the people that they may see whose pretences are best. But Men may pretend what they will; some Sectaries pretend to infallibility, as much as the Pope or Council; but the people concerned must be Judges which of their pretences are best grounded, and so they must concerning our pretences to Scripture.

§ 8. Now these being false, *there is an end of Mr. M's Book that is grounded on them*. If the Reformation was a good work, it was the Duty of the Pastours of the Church to promote it: and they needed no other Authority but what is inherent in their Office to perform it. The true question is therefore, not concerning Mission, but the Goodness of the Reformation. And I find Mr. M. has no great mind to dispute that question. The personal Faults of the Reformers are nothing to this. Wicked Men may do a good thing: and honest Men may do an ill thing by mistake or ignorance. Those may be bad that seem good, and those be good Men whom the World counts Impostors. We have a Rule to judge of the truth or falshood, the good or evil of Doctrines; but the judgment concerning men is best left to God. Mr. M. takes the contrary way, and would first Judge and Condemn the Men, and then from thence against all Reason infer the Good or Evil, the Truth or Falshood of their Doctrine.



FINIS.

662

